

FACULTY COUNCIL
Minutes
Wednesday, October 30th, 2019
3:00-5:00 PM – CLC 206, WTC; IC 332, LSC; SSOM 429, HSD

Members Present: Borys, D.; Boykin, T.; Brown, J.; Caughie, P.; Dahari, H.; Davis, T.; Dong, Q.; Gillespie, L.; Graham, D.; Johnson, B.; Jules, T.; Kang, H.; Langman, L.; Lash, N.; Martin, C.; Miller, H.; Moore, K.; Moran, G.; Pierre, D.; Pope, L.; Roberts, E.; Rushin, S.; Shoenberger, A.

Meeting was called to order at 3:05pm by the Chair (Jules).

1. Approval of September 25th, 2019 minutes. Moved (Pope); seconded (Johnson). Motion passed (18-0-0).
2. Committee Breakout Groups (3:10-3:35pm)
3. Visit from David Slavsky, Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE): New course evaluation system (3:35-4:00pm).
 - o The new course evaluation system is called SmartEvals, and we are rolling out for the first time this semester. This replaces the old IDEA system hosted by CampusLabs, which we've had since 2013. It was chosen by a committee composed of faculty from all campuses of the University, students, administrators, and representatives of IT. Three companies submitted bids to our RfP (one of them was IDEA). The committee quickly agreed that the IDEA bid was unacceptable, and that the other two bids each represented better options. The two remaining bidders came twice to campus, and after their presentations the committee's consensus was that SmartEvals was better.
 - o How does SmartEvals differ from IDEA? Around this time last year you would've been receiving an email asking you to go into your course evaluation modules and select questions from among the thirteen that IDEA had applied to all courses in the University. But instructors often found that many, sometimes most, of those questions were irrelevant, uninformative, or useless for their particular course. Nothing like that happens now. Over the summer, we formed a university task force, and met to develop a list of fourteen questions of our own which we think are relevant and pertinent to courses across the University. (They can be reviewed here: <https://wwwh.smartevals.com/student/evaluation508.aspx?p=t&t=q&s=636&c=51633>.) The committee worked very hard to ensure the relevance of the question set to Loyola courses. Faculty have an option to add one additional question to each course, if they choose. A great advantage is that the system is customizable at every level, unlike IDEA. Departments or schools can also add up to three sets of questions, with a maximum of five questions per set, to courses that they designate; some have already done so. (These limits are intended to ensure higher levels of response from students.) Students can complete the survey in no more than 10-15 minutes, and can do so on their laptops, tablets, or phones, either at school or at home. We also face the problem of the

complexity of course schedules at LUC; there are 53 different course beginning and ending dates, for example, in the fall semester across the University. It was a complex task to develop an algorithm with SmartEvals to ensure the correct start date, and to date, report to department date, and report to instructor date for each of these courses. We are trying to insure that students have enough time to complete the surveys, but that the course survey dates always close before final exams/grades. Unlike IDEA, there are no “raw” vs. “adjusted” scores in the ratings; nor are scores normalized against scores at other institutions. Finally, SmartEvals affords us a very large suite of data analysis resources, much larger than IDEA did. For example, the tools will give us the ability to see whether there any systematic biases that are creeping into the evaluation system — gender of the responder, gender of the instructor, etc. We’re very interested in knowing about these things.

- Question: does it help student evaluation rates if students are allowed to complete the survey in class? DS: yes, the data shows this.
- Question: there isn’t really a “self-evaluation” (i.e., for the student) component to these questions. In the old paper-based surveys, department would often ask the students to rate their own level of effort in the course. Did you consider putting in this kind of question? DS: yes we did, but decided against it on this first go-round. But the nice thing about SmartEvals is that nothing is written in stone, and we can always add questions like that in the future.
- Question: are the evaluations anonymous, from the point of view of the instructor? DS: yes. (Demonstration course evaluation instructor report displayed and discussed.)
- Question: can faculty get a list of the students who have completed the survey by the end of the semester? (Some of us incentivize students to complete the survey by awarding them a small number of course grade points.) DS: no, unfortunately not. You can get numbers/percentages of completion, but not names.

4. Committee Work and Assignments

- We need three more members on the Academic Affairs committee and one more member for the Bylaws committee.
 - Question: can faculty who are not members of Faculty Council be asked to serve on the committees? Chair: I will look into this.

5. Faculty Council Retreat

- Let us plan to meet Friday January 10th, 9:00am-3:00pm, location TBA. We will post a Google Forms page to solicit input for discussion topics—our mission, shared governance, etc.

6. Updates

- Wayne Magdziarz will speak at our next meeting; please feel free to send me any questions you think he should be asked.

- By next meeting we should have a good idea of how many faculty members will be taking the TF-VTIP retirement buyout offer. (Although the absolute final deadline will be two days after our meeting.)

7. Healthcare Aetna Transition

- The AAUP Lakeside Campus Chapter survey results of the faculty on their view of the Aetna transition are quite substantial, and damning. The administration had informed us that there should be no more than about 3.6% of providers who had previously been in the BCBS-IL network who would be out of network under Aetna; the survey results suggest that this is a substantial underestimate. I (Chair) have communicated the faculty's concerns about the disruption and loss of coverage caused by this transition, as well as concerns about irregularities of process — the Shared Benefits committee, which had faculty representation and should've been consulted in this process, appears not to have been.

- Remark (Moore): I have some concerns about whether it is ethical for us to release information from the AAUP survey, since the respondents gave that information not to us but to the AAUP for specific reason. (Some of the responses are qualitatively horrifying to read.) I think we can (and I've begun to) do some basic data analysis — not publication level quality, but useful, since it's not truly randomized data — on the report to get some idea of the general patterns with de-identified data.
- Remark (Shoenberger): I served on the shared benefits committee some years ago, and I learned that the University is “self-insured,” and that what we pay BCBS or Aetna for is the administration and management of our insurance system.
- Further discussion, formulation of resolution:

- **Resolution:** *Whereas:*

- The recent decision to change health care providers was made without any consultation with shared governance bodies;
- the Benefits Advisory Committee, which ought to have vetted such a change, has not been staffed for years;
- health care is the largest expense in most faculty/staff paychecks;
- the announcement of the change was made without adequate information being made available to faculty and staff, or even Human Resources staff charged with fielding employee benefits questions;
- many faculty and staff have reported to Council members that they are scrambling to find new doctors; that finding doctors in certain specialties (mental health, cardiology, dermatology) is especially challenging; and that many cannot or do not want to change doctors at this point;
- President Rooney emphasized her commitment to collaboration in a speech to the faculty in September;

Be It Resolved That,

1. The Faculty Council expresses its consternation and shock at the way this decision was made and announced;
2. calls for a reconsideration of the transition to Aetna;
3. calls for the reconstitution of the Benefits Advisory Committee;
4. and urges President Rooney to commit to practicing shared governance in future decisions.

Motion passed, 22-0-1.

8. Motion to adjourn, 5:05pm (Conley); second (Martin).

Respectfully submitted by
Hugh Miller, PhD, Secretary